

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 12, 2008 in which claim 69 was allowed and in which claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 12, 16, 26, 28-34, 36-38, 52-60, 62, 63, 66- 68 and 70 were rejected. With this response, claim 16 is canceled and claims 1, 26, 67 and 70 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 12, 26, 28-34, 36-38, 52-60, 62, 63 and 66-70 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary

On March 6, 2009, a telephonic interview is held between Examiner Shah and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of claims 1, 16, 26, 67 and 70 was discussed. It was agreed upon that the above amendments to claims 1, 26, 67 and 70 overcome the current rejections of such claims.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Shah for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for the Examiner's suggested claim language revisions to better clarify the claims and patentably distinguish the claims over the prior art of record.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 26, 28-29 and 57-60 under 35 USC 102(e) based upon Donahue

Section 1 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 26, 28-29 and 57-60 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Donahue US Patent 6155669. As noted above, during the Examiner Interview dated March 6, 2009, it was agreed upon that the above amendments to claims 1 and 26 overcome the rejection based upon Donahue. Claims 2, 28-29 and 57-60 depend from claim 1 or claim 26 and overcome the rejection for at least the same reasons.

III. Rejection of Claims 5-8, 10, 12, 16, 30-34, 36-38, 52-60, 62-63 and 66-68 and 70 under 35 USC 103(a) based upon Donahue and Kitahara

Section 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 5-8, 10, 12, 16, 30-34, 36-38, 52-60, 62-63 and 66-68 and 70 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donahue US Patent 6155669 in view of Kitahara US Patent 6672705. Claim 16 is canceled. As noted above, during the Examiner Interview dated March 6, 2009, it was agreed upon that the above amendments to claims 1, 26, 67 and 70 overcome the rejection based upon Donahue. Claims 5-8, 10, 12, 30-34, 36-38, 52-60, 62-63, 66 and 68 depend from claim 1 or claim 26 and overcome the rejection for at least the same reasons.

IV. Conclusion

Upon entry of the amendments to the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 12, 26, 28-34, 36-38, 52 -60 and 62-63 and 66-70 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10018225-1

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 19, 2009

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW

Customer No. 22879

Telephone: (262) 478-9353

Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 38,276